

**REMARKS**

These remarks respond to the Office Action mailed December 14, 2005.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 5, 16, 23, 32, 43, 50, 59, 70, and 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking antecedent basis for the limitation "second party."

As discussed with Examiner Winter on May 4, 2006, applicants believe this to be an error because the term "second party" is recited in the preamble of these claims. The Examiner agreed and stated that the claims were inadvertently rejected and the objection would be withdrawn. The Examiner also stated that once the objection was withdrawn, the claims would be in condition for immediate allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his courtesy in revisiting this rejection and discussing the matter on the telephone.


If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he may have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Jeffrey S. Dickey  
Registration No.: 35,858  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant